



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,151	04/16/2002	Takashi Shigematsu	13723-002001	8643

7590
Y Rocky Tsao
Fish & Richardson
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 01110-2804

07/13/2005

EXAMINER

LUM, LEON YUN BON

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1641

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/009,151	Applicant(s) SHIGEMATSU ET AL.	
	Examiner Leon Y. Lum	Art Unit 1641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-57 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22-26 and 30-57 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

M

S.O.O

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 27-29 in the reply filed on 06 June 2005 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: The instant claim recites the deposit number FERM BP-7171 in reference to the mouse-mouse hybridoma FOHa1/DLD3. However, the specification discloses the same deposit number as referring to hybridoma FOH1a/DLH3 (see page 30, lines 25-27) and the cited reference in the same section of the specification also discloses the deposit number as referring to hybridoma FOH1a/DLH3. Therefore, it seems as if the claimed hybridoma should read FOH1a/DLH3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 28 recites the hybridoma FOHa1/DLD3 (FERM BP-7171). This hybridoma is essential to practice the claimed invention. However, the specification does not indicate that this cell line was deposited under the terms of the Budapest treaty and that it will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent.

If the deposit of hybridoma FOHa1/DLD3 (FERM BP-7171) has been made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, an affidavit or declaration by applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature, stating that hybridoma FOHa1/DLD3 (FERM BP-7171) has been deposited under the Budapest Treaty and that hybridoma FOHa1/DLD3 (FERM BP-7171) will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein. See 37 CFR 1.808. Further, the record must be clear that the deposit will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years after the date of deposit or 5 years after the last request for a sample or for the enforceable life of the patent, whichever is longer. See 37 CFR 1.806 and MPEP 2410-2410.01. If the deposit has not been made under the Budapest treaty, then

Art Unit: 1641

an affidavit or declaration by applicants or someone associated with the patent owner who is in a position to make such assurances, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature must be made, stating that the deposit has been made at an acceptable depository and that the criteria set forth in 37 CFR 1.801-1.809, have been met.

If the deposit was made after the effective filing date of the application for a patent in the United States, a verified statement is required from a person in a position to corroborate that the vector described in the specification as filed are the same as that deposited in the depository. Corroboration may take the form of a showing of a chain of custody from applicant to the depository coupled with corroboration that the deposit is identical to the biological material described in the specification and in the applicant's possession at the time the application was filed.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. In claim 27, line 4, the term "the solution" is vague and indefinite. It is unclear whether the instant term refers to the frozen solution (line 2) or the solution containing denatured lipoprotein (line 3).

8. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01.

One omitted step is how denatured lipoprotein is produced from melting a frozen solution of lipoprotein. Is the lipoprotein denatured through the melting process, the freezing process, a combination of the two, or another step that is not recited?

Another omitted step is how the denatured lipoprotein is stabilized, as introduced in the preamble of the instant claim.

9. Claim 28 is vague and indefinite because it is in improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The instant claim is directed to a step of reacting the denatured lipoprotein with an antibody. However, since the parent claim (claim 27) is directed only to a method of producing a stabilized denatured lipoprotein, the binding step in the instant claim does not further limit the parent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1641

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

12. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belzner et al (US 3,632,473) in view of Gebski et al (US 5,783,400).

Art Unit: 1641

Belzner et al reference teaches the steps of freezing and quick thawing of plasma to denature lipoproteins (i.e. freezing and melting a solution to produce a solution containing denatured lipoprotein). See column 6, lines 54-65.

However, Belzner et al reference fails to teach the step of freeze-drying the ~~thawed~~ solution.

Gebski et al reference teaches the step of lyophilizing lipoprotein in plasma, in order to prepare lipoproteins in a stable formulation, wherein the lipoprotein is Lp(a). See column 8, lines 13-17.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Belzner et al with the step of lyophilizing lipoprotein in plasma, as taught by Gebski et al, in order to prepare lipoproteins in a stable formulation. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have had reasonable expectation of success in including the step of lyophilizing lipoprotein in plasma, as taught by Gebski et al, in the method of Belzner et al, since Belzner et al also teach steps involving plasma.

Conclusion

14. No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1641

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Y. Lum whose telephone number is (571) 272-2878. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le can be reached on (571) 272-0823. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leon Y. Lum
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1641



LYL



CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800/641

7/11/05